DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 407 TM 030 559

AUTHOR	Farrell, Donna; Reed, Dan
TITLE	"Invitations to Literacy": Results of the First-Year Implementation Survey.
PUB DATE	1999-11-00
NOTE	36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association (Monterey, CA, November 17-19, 1999).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Curriculum; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; *Language Arts; *Literacy; Program Implementation; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Surveys

ABSTRACT

The implementation of the Houghton-Mifflin K-5 "Invitations to Literacy" language arts program was studied during its first year in California's Moreno Valley Unified School District. A sample teacher survey was developed, pilot tested, and sent to the District. The sample consisted of 658 regular, 20 special day, 19 resource specialist, and 118 limited English proficiency classroom teachers in 19 elementary schools. Out of a total of 815 teachers, 411 surveys from 15 schools were returned. Teachers reported using the program between 25 and 90% of the time and spending between 30 minutes and 3 hours each week planning instruction. They rated the program "fair" in regard to its ease of implementation, use, and overall effectiveness in helping students meet standards. Teachers were most dissatisfied with the assessment component, especially its alignment with the instructional component. Only half of the teachers involved responded to the survey, but their survey results pointed to implementation issues that should be considered in future program adoption. (Contains seven appendixes including survey and supplemental information about the program's implementation.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE

The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: TM

In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. CS

ED 437 407

[1]Invitations to Literacy: Results of the First-Year Implementation Survey

Donna Farrell and Dan Reed

Office of Research and Evaluation
Moreno Valley Unified School District
13911 Perris Boulevard
Moreno Valley, CA 92553
(909) 485-5600 Ext. 2235

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Farrell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

[1]Paper presented at the 1999 California Educational Research Association Conference, November 17-19, Monterey, CA.

TM030559

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Invitations to Literacy
Results of the First-Year Implementation Survey

School districts spend billions of tax dollars each year on a variety of subject area programs. The assumption is that when these programs are fully implemented by competent teachers, the desired skills and competencies will be developed in our nation's students. However, a number of critical factors influence the implementation of any school program. These factors typically fall into two major categories: 1) school factors and 2) program factors. Among the school factors that influence how well a program is implemented are the:

- Amount of Program implementation training and support that is provided to teachers, by both the publisher and the school district.
- Teachers' experience with implementing similar programs,
- Teacher's acceptance of the program, and
- Administration's program accountability system (i.e., if and how administrators hold teachers accountable for implementing the program).

Program factors influencing effective implementation usually revolve around validity issues (i.e., how well the program has been designed and developed to accomplish its goal). Generally speaking, a valid program is one that consists of a complete set of instructional materials that provide adequate instruction and sufficient practice in the program's skill and content areas and, when fully implemented, will produce the desired learner outcomes. The specified learner outcomes are verified in the results of classroom field studies, which also document that:

- There is a clear alignment of lesson objectives with practice and assessment activities.
- All materials needed to implement each lesson and evaluate student learning are complete and useable.
- The instructional and assessment guides are easy to understand and follow.
- The time needed to plan instruction, implement the lessons, and assess students' learning is not excessive.

Although school and program implementation factors have long been known to impact student achievement (Hanson and Schutz, 1978), for the most part, the numerous research studies carried out on "effective teaching" never take them into account. For example, research tells us that one of the highest correlates of student achievement is teacher "task orientation." It further states that the single most effective way to assure "task orientation" is for teachers to base their lessons on the adopted program for the subject or grade (Borich, 1992). Yet few studies obtain any measures of program implementation. Most are carried out with the assumption that all teachers fully implement the district-adopted programs placed in their classrooms exactly as prescribed.

However, we also know from this same body of research, and from the wisdom of practice, that this is a grossly erroneous assumption; nothing could be further from the truth. Teachers teach and implement programs in a wide variety of ways and, at the end of the year there are significant differences in pupil learning. These differences in learning are usually linked to social class and other bio-social factors that provide no practical solutions for increasing student achievement.

For school districts to find solutions for increasing student achievement levels, they must focus on those factors that they **can** change and that **are** under their control, such as the ensuring that valid programs are being properly implemented in all classrooms. Administrators need to know, for example, if these differences in teachers' program implementation practices have an impact the level of their students' achievement and, if so, which practices/programs have the greatest effects. Knowing this would allow teachers to target their instructional efforts on the achievement-related factors that are not only under their direct control, but which provide the highest "pay-off" in terms of student achievement gains.

SURVEY PURPOSE, INSTRUMENT, AND USES

The first year of implementation of the Houghton-Mifflin K-5 Invitations to Literacy Language Arts Program in the Moreno Valley Unified School District (MVUSD) was during the 1998-99 school year. In the spring of 1999, a "First-Year Implementation Survey" was developed for the purpose of obtaining information about the first-year Program implementation practices of teachers (See Appendix A). This two-page, 35-item questionnaire sought to obtain user information in four areas:

1. The number of Program Themes completed by teachers;
2. The amount of time teachers spent on Program implementation (e.g., preparing, implementing, and assessing Program lessons);
3. The lesson choices and supplemental program materials that were used by teachers; and
4. Teachers' perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the Program.

This instrument was piloted on two different occasions to ensure the appropriateness of both the survey items and the response categories. The survey was initially piloted with the elementary Literacy Leaders, a group of language arts teachers representing each elementary school. After making the revisions suggested by this group of teachers, a second version of the survey instrument was piloted with teachers in a Title I school. Changes made in this second version resulted in the final version of the survey instrument (See Appendix A).

The results were used to compile a "Status Report" for school principals. Principals could use this status information to determine a baseline that would allow them to project how much of the Program they should expect their teachers to complete during the second year of implementation. This information would also tell them which teachers are having difficulty implementing the Program, and which lesson components teachers find ineffective or difficult to implement.

At the District level, these data would eventually be linked to student achievement data to provide essential information on the program's validity, costs, and benefits. It is important to know, for example:

- Is this Program developing the skills and competencies in students that it claims to develop?
- Do students completing more of the Program have higher levels of achievement than those completing less?
- Which lesson choices, or patterns of instruction, have the highest relationship to the SAT9 and California augmented test scores?
- What are the actual costs required to implement this program (i.e., resources, personnel, and time)?

Bottom line, what the District would like to know is, are the gains in student achievement worth the implementation costs or would a less expensive program produce the same or better results in a shorter amount of time for this student population?

SURVEY RETURNS

The "First-Year Implementation Survey" and the instructions for administering, completing, and returning it were mailed out to the principals of all MVUSD elementary schools in May of 1999 and returned by the first week in June. At the time the survey was completed, there was a total of 19 elementary schools with 658 regular, 20 special day (SDC), 19 resource specialist (RSP), and 118 limited language proficiency (LEP) classroom teachers in the District. This is a total of 815 teachers for whom the Invitations to Literacy Program was purchased, at a cost to the District of $1,332,772.85. All of these teachers were expected to use the Program in their classrooms to teach reading and language arts.

Four hundred and eleven (411) surveys from 15 schools were returned to the District. This represented approximately a 50 % teacher response rate and a 79% school response rate. The number of surveys returned to the District, by school and grade level, are given in Table 1 in Appendix B. Of the 15 schools returning the survey:

- Ten (10) were Title I schools.
- Fifty (50) teachers indicated that they taught a special needs classes (i.e., special education or LEP).

- One (1) school did not have replies from all grade levels and too few replies to create a status report. It is likely that many of the responses from this school are contained in the "Not Identified" response set.

- All other schools had an adequate number of replies from teachers representing all grade levels.

SURVEY RESULTS

Program Implementation Correlation Matrix

Table 2 in Appendix C shows the correlations among the Program implementation items. These correlations show what would be expected. That is, there are significant correlations among the "Percent of Language Arts Time the Program Was Used" and:

- The time spent planning lessons each week;
- The time spent teaching lessons each week;
- The time spent assessing students each month; and
- The program effectiveness rating.

In other words, the more of their language arts time that teachers spent teaching with this Program, the more time they spent on planning, teaching, and assessing Program lessons, and the higher they rated it as being an effective program.

Amount of Time Spent on Program Implementation

Table 3 in Appendix D shows the amount of time teachers spent, at each grade level, implementing the Invitations to Literacy Program. The amount of time spent on Program implementation this first year can be summarized as follows:

- Month Instruction Began

The vast majority of teachers (89%), including kindergarten, began instruction in the Program in July, August, or September. This is reasonable since these months coincide with the beginning of the traditional and year round school years. However, 14% reported starting a late as either January, February, or March.

- Program Themes Completed This Year

As noted in Table 4, Appendix E, at least 50 percent of the kindergarten teachers (i.e., 31 out of 61) reported completing eight of the twelve Program Themes.

Looking at Table 5, it can be seen that approximately 45 percent of the first grade teachers (i.e., 29 out of 65) completed five of the ten Program Themes and about 50 percent of the teachers in grades 2 through 5 completed four out of the six Program Themes.

- Amount of Time Spent Planning Program Lessons Each Week

Fifty-six (56) percent of the teachers reported spending between thirty minutes and three hours planning for instruction with this Program each week, while 41 percent said they spent between four and seven hours planning instruction.

- Amount of Time Spent Teaching Program Lessons Each Week

The amount of time teachers spent each week teaching the Program lessons was fairly evenly distributed (range =15 to 23%) among the second through sixth response categories. However, the response categories with the highest percents were:

1) 5-6 hours of instruction per week (22.5%); and
2) 10+ hours of instruction per week (20.5%).

The reader is reminded that this sample includes kindergarten teachers who only teach half-day classes and, therefore, have less instructional time, per class. When the amount of time that the kindergarten and elementary teachers reported teaching Program lessons was examined separately, both sets of responses also tended to be evenly distributed among several of the response categories.

Kindergarten teachers tended to respond to first three response categories:

1) 2 hours or less per week (25%);
2) 3 - 4 hours per week (22%); and
3) 5 - 6 hours per week (22%).

Elementary teachers' responses were mostly in the following categories:

1) 5 - 6 hours per week (23%)
2) 7 – 8 hours per week (20%)
3) 10+ hours per week (25%)

- Amount of Time Spent Assessing Program Lessons Each Month

Fifteen percent of the teachers said they did not formally assess their students on a monthly basis. When this item was examined separately for kindergarten and grades 1-5, results indicated that 23% of the kindergarten teachers did not formally assess their students on a monthly basis, while only 9% of the grades 1-5 teachers did not.

Forty-four percent of the teachers spent between two and five hours assessing students in this program each month and seventeen percent reported spending eight or more hours per month. Although not show in this table, most teachers of special needs classes reported spending 6 to 8+ hours on assessment each month. Also, while 23% of the kindergarten teachers indicated that they did no formal assessments on a monthly basis, 23% also reported that they spent between 2 and 3 hours on formal assessment each month.

It should be noted that "formal assessment" was defined as "administering, and assessing/grading students' work for a grade, progress or benchmark reports, and/or placement in a 'Best Work' portfolio." Thus, the assessment time reported was for ALL formal assessments for this program – not just benchmark assessments. Further, to make the amount of time spent on assessment comparable to the amount of time spent on the other kinds of Program implementation activities, the assessment hours should be converted to a weekly average. For example, the highest assessment response category, 'eight or more hours a month,' averages out to a about two hours a week.

- Percentage of the Language Arts Time The Program Was Used

The percent of the language arts time that the Program was used by teachers was almost equally distributed across three of the five response categories: 24 percent reported using it 25-50 percent of the time; 26 percent used it 50-75% of the time; and 30 percent used it 75-90% of the time.

Program Lesson Choices

Tables 4 and 5 in Appendix E show the Program lesson and supplemental material choices of the kindergarten and the first through fifth grade teachers, respectively. It should be noted that some program choices (i.e., supplemental programs) were not available to all teachers. It depended on the site as to whether or not these materials were purchased for them to use.

Looking first at Table 4, and examining the reported lesson choices of the kindergarten teachers, the following findings are evident:

- Those lessons or supplementary programs that at least 50% of the teachers reported using in the following two response categories were:

  "Almost Always"
  - Watch Me Read Lessons (82%)
  - Reading and Listening Center Lessons (65%)
  - Little Book Program (52%)

"Sometimes"

- Preparing to Listen and Read Lessons (79%)
- Cross Curricular Lessons (77%)
- Language and Writing Center Lessons (63%)
- Emergent Literacy Survey (60%)
- Mini Lessons (56%)

- As indicated by the small percentages in the "Not At All" response category, very few teachers indicated that they did not implement the Program choices at all. Program choices with the highest percentages of **"Not At All"** use were all in the supplementary Program materials category:
  - Early Success Program (67%)
  - Students Acquiring English (48%)
  - Emergent Literacy Survey (32%)
  - Literacy Activity Book Lessons (26%)

Turning to Table 5 and examining the teaching choices of teachers in grades one through five, results indicate:

- Those lessons or supplementary programs that at least 50% of the teachers reported using in the following two response categories were:

  "Almost Always"
  - Vocabulary Lessons (83%)
  - Reading Comprehension Lessons (78%)
  - High Frequency and Key Works (74%)
  - Reading Strategies Lessons (59%)

  "Sometimes"
  - Mini Lessons (55%)
  - Preparing to Read and Write Lessons (53%)

- Like the kindergarten teacher choices, there were small percentages in the "Not At All" response category. The only Program choices with a significant percentage of **"Not At All"** use was the "Watch Me Read" Lessons (25%). However, for this lesson choice, teacher responses were fairly evenly distributed among all three response categories. While 25% reported they did not use these lessons at all, 40% said they used them "Almost Always," and 35% said they used them "Sometimes."

Program Effectiveness Rating

Tables 6 and 7 in Appendix F show teacher ratings on their perceptions of the Program's ease of implementation, use, and overall effectiveness in preparing students to meet State and District standards in language arts, by school and by grade level, respectively. As Table 6 indicates, most teachers in the vast majority of schools rated the program as "Fair." This meant that most teachers felt that one or more of the Program components needed some major revisions.

Interestingly enough, when the grade level ratings are examined in Table 7, it can be seen that most of the kindergarten teachers give the Program a higher rating of "Good," indicating they felt the Program only needed a few minor adjustments. This was most surprising considering the number of complaints initially received from the kindergarten teachers regarding the inappropriateness of the Program in terms of its lesson and assessment activities.

Unsatisfactory Program Components

The final table, Table 8 in Appendix H, shows the results of the teacher responses on the "Unsatisfactory Program Components" item. This item asked only those teachers who rated the Program as "Fair" or "Poor" to identify the component(s) they considered unsatisfactory. Although not many teachers responded to this item, those that did typically selected the assessment component as the one needing a major revision.

There were also a number of responses in the "Other" response category. Teachers selecting this category were expected to write in a response. In most cases, the "Other" responses could easily fit into one of the other three categories. For example, many of these "Other" responses centered on deficiencies in the lab book, vocabulary, spelling, and/or phonics lessons. Also several teachers commented on the confusing organization and excessiveness of the lesson materials. Finally, there were responses stating that the instructional level was too advanced for their students, particularly at the beginning of the school year. All of these responses apply to the Program's "Instructional Materials" and would fall into that category.

Teachers were also asked to make additional comments about the Program on the back of the survey instruction sheet. While there were only seven teachers who responded in this manner, their comments were extensive and centered around the following issues:

- The amount of time involved in preparing, implementing, and assessing Program lessons;
- The feeling that teachers were overwhelmed by all of the Program components and the lack of inservice to show them how to properly implement them.
- The insufficient amount of appropriate practice activities to allow the students to learn the skills and concepts the lessons teach.
- The failure of the practice activities and lab books to align with the assessment materials.
- The inappropriateness of the Program for low ability students.

SUMMARY

The purpose of the survey was to obtain information on the first-year implementation practices of those elementary teachers in the Moreno Valley Unified School District using the K-5 Invitations to Literacy Language Arts Program. The results of this survey are in no way intended to imply "best practices"; they only reveal what "is." It will take at least one to two more years of analyzing Program implementation patterns and relating them to student achievement data for a "best practice" scenario to emerge.

Based on the results of this survey, elementary teachers in general:

- Used the Program to teach language arts in their classrooms between 25 and 90 percent of the time.
- Spent between thirty minutes and three hours each week planning instruction in this Program.
- Taught the majority of the Program lesson choices at least some of the time.
- Rated the Program as "Fair" in regard to its ease of implementation, use, and overall effectiveness in helping students to meet standards.
- Were most dissatisfied with the assessment component, in particular, the alignment of the assessment component with the instructional component.

Kindergarten Teachers:

- Spent between two and six hours each week implementing the Program in their classroom.
- Completed instruction in eight out of the twelve Program Themes.
- Either did not formally assess their students in this Program on a monthly basis or spent between two and three hours each month on formal assessment.

Teachers in Grades 1-5:

- Spent between five and ten hours each week implementing the Program in their classroom.
- Completed instruction in either five out of the ten Program Themes (1st grade teachers) or four out of the six Program Themes (2nd through 5th grade teachers).
- Spent between two and ten hours on formal assessment in this Program each month.

While the majority of teachers rated this Program as only "fair," and there were a number of negative comments about it, recall that only 50% of all MVUSD teachers responded to this survey. Also, this was the first year of implementation of a very comprehensive program. As teachers become more familiar with its components, they should become more adept at implementing it. Remember, those teachers who spent more time using the program tended to rate it higher than those using it less. Finally, only a small percentage of teachers responded when asked to provide specific information on what they felt was the Program's shortcomings.

However, this in no way implies that their comments should be taken lightly or dismissed, either in regard to this Program or ones being considered for future adoption. Only by resolving these critical implementation issues. preferably PRIOR to adoption, can a District expect teachers to fully and successfully implement a program --- And only by monitoring and verifying program implementation can districts begin to link classroom instruction to student achievement.

References

Borich, G.D. (1992). Effective Teaching Methods. New York: Macmillan Publishing Co.

Hanson, R.A. & Schutz, R.E. (1979). A new look at schooling effects from programmatic research and development. In D. Mann (Ed.). Making Change Happen? Pp. 120-149, Teachers College Press: New York.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Invitations to Literacy: First-Year Implementation Survey

Appendix B: Table 1: First-Year Implementation Survey Returns by School and Grade Level

Appendix C: Table 2: Implementation Correlations

Appendix D: Table 3: Amount of Time Teachers Spent each Week/Month Implementing the Invitations to Literacy Program.

Appendix E: Table 4: Kindergarten Program Implementation Choices.
Table 5: First through Fifth Grade Program Implementation Choices.

Appendix F: Table 6: Program Effectiveness Rating by School.
Table 7 Program Effectiveness Rating by Grade Level.

Appendix G: Table 8: Unsatisfactory Program Components.

APPENDIX A

Invitations to Literacy
First-Year Implementation Survey

School Number:

Grade Taught:

Special Needs Class?
No Yes

Implementation Time

1. In what month did you begin instruction in the Invitations to Literacy program?

Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
25%	22%	43%	7%	2%	1%	7%	2%	5%

Note: Percents were rounded up to omit decimals and will add up to more than 100%.

For items 2 - 4, indicate the amount of time you spent on each of the following Invitations to Literacy activities:

2. **Planning and preparing** for instruction **each WEEK** (including checking homework assignments); total time, about:

	%
Less than 30 minutes	3
30 minutes - 1 hour	14
2-3 hours	43
4-5 hours	23
6-7 hours	9
8+ hours	10

3. **Actively engaged** in the instructional process **each WEEK** (i.e. teaching program lessons and providing feedback during classroom instruction and student practice activities), total time, about:

	%
2 hours or less	9
3-4 hours	16
5-6 hours	23
7-8 hours	17
9-10 hours	15
10+ hours	21

4. **Formally assessing** students **each MONTH** on lesson or theme skills and concepts (e.g., administering and assessing/grading students' work for: a grade, progress or benchmark reports, and/or placement in a "Best Work" portfolio), total time, about:

I do not typically formally assess students on a monthly basis	15%
1 hour or less	8%
2-3 hours	23%
4-5 hours	21%
6 hours	12%
7 hours	5%
8+ hours	17%

5. Approximately what proportion of your total language arts classroom time did you spend **each WEEK** teaching the Invitations to Literacy program?

(4%)→0-25% (24%)→25-50%(26%)→50-75%(30%)→75-90%(18%)→90-100%

Themes Completed

6. At this time, which theme numbers have you **fully** implemented (i.e., **all or most** of the theme lessons, practice activities, and assessments were taught and/or given to students).

K-[illegible]hers (N=61)	39 1	36 2	37 3	37 4	44 5	40 6	32 7	31 8	26 9	17 10	8 11	7 12
1-5 Teachers (N=350)	190	181	201	199	130	80	44	28	12	9		

Note: Kindergarten program had 12 Themes, the first grade had 10 Themes, and 2-5 program had 6 Themes.

Lesson Choices

Invitations to Literacy provides instructional options within each lesson. Using the appropriate grade level category below, indicate how often you taught each of the "lesson choices".

*Not At All (e.g., you typically omitted from your instruction),
*Sometimes (e.g., you chose to teach from time to time), and
*Almost Always (e.g., you seldom, if ever, omitted from your instruction).

Kindergarten See Table 4 Appendix E

Lesson Choices	Not At All	Sometimes	Almost Always
7. Preparing to Listen and Write			
8. Reading Strategies			
9. Mini Lessons			
10. Reading/Listening Center			
11. Language/Writing Center			
12. Cross-Curricular Activities			
13. Watch Me Read			

Grades 1-5 See Table 5 Appendix E

Lesson Choices	Not At All	Sometimes	Almost Always
14. Watch Me Read			
15. Preparing to Read and Write			
16. High Frequency and/or Key Words			
17. Reading Strategies			
18. Mini Lessons			
19. Comprehension			
20. Phonics/Decoding OR Word Skills			
21. Vocabulary			
22. Language and Writing			
23. Spelling			
24. Grammar			
25. Communications			
26. Independent/Guided Reading & Writing			
27. Cross-Curricular Activities			

Support Materials See Tables 4 and 5, Appendix E

Indicate how often you used other Invitations to Literacy program materials, as prescribed, throughout the year.

	Not At All	Sometimes	Almost Always
28. Emergent Literacy Survey			
29. The Literacy Activity Book			
30. Students Acquiring English			
31. Spelling			
32. Early Success			
33. Little Books for Guided Reading			

34. Rate the Invitations to Literacy program in terms of its ease of implementation, use, and overall effectiveness in preparing students to meet State/District standards in reading, writing, and speaking. See Tables 6 and 7 Appendix

Excellent. I wouldn't change a thing.
Good. The Program needs only some minor adjustments.
Fair. Some of the Program components need major revisions.
Poor. The Program has major design flaws that make it ineffective and difficult to implement.

35. If you marked Fair or Poor for Number 34, which program components do you feel need the major revisions? (Mark all that apply). See Table 8 Appendix G

Teacher Support (Teacher's Book, annotated editions, and inservice)
Instruction (Lesson content, format, and practice activities)
Assessment (Student monitoring and assessment materials)
Other: _____
Does not apply

Table 1: **First-Year Implementation Survey Returns by School and Grade Level**

		Grade Taught							
		Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
		Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
School Name	School Not Identified	3	4.9%	2	3.1%	7	11.3%	7	9.2%
	Edgemont	2	3.3%	4	6.2%	4	6.5%	3	3.9%
	Midland	5	8.2%	5	7.7%	3	4.8%	4	5.3%
	Moreno	3	4.9%	3	4.6%	2	3.2%	4	5.3%
	Armada	5	8.2%	6	9.2%	3	4.8%	6	7.9%
	Bear Valley	6	9.8%	4	6.2%	7	11.3%	7	9.2%
	Sunnymeadows	7	11.5%	8	12.3%	5	8.1%	6	7.9%
	Butterfield	4	6.6%	6	9.2%	2	3.2%	7	9.2%
	Hendrick Ranch	3	4.9%	4	6.2%	3	4.8%	7	9.2%
	Serrano	4	6.6%	5	7.7%	5	8.1%	4	5.3%
	Sugar Hill	5	8.2%	4	6.2%	2	3.2%	2	2.6%
	Seneca					4	6.5%		
	Creekside	4	6.6%	4	6.2%	4	6.5%	4	5.3%
	Hidden Springs	2	3.3%	4	6.2%	4	6.5%	6	7.9%
	Box Springs	5	8.2%	5	7.7%	4	6.5%	6	7.9%
	Ridge Crest	3	4.9%	1	1.5%	3	4.8%	3	3.9%
Total		61	100.0%	65	100.0%	62	100.0%	76	100.0%

Table 1 Cont. **First-Year Implementation Survey Returns by School and Grade Level**

		Grade Taught						Total	
		Fourth Grade		Fifth Grade		Grade Not Identified			
		Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
School Name	School Not Identified	1	3.0%	1	3.1%	11	13.4%	32	7.8%
	Edgemont	3	9.1%	1	3.1%	11	13.4%	28	6.8%
	Midland	2	6.1%	4	12.5%	7	8.5%	30	7.3%
	Moreno	3	9.1%	2	6.3%	8	9.8%	25	6.1%
	Armada	4	12.1%	1	3.1%	4	4.9%	29	7.1%
	Bear Valley	3	9.1%	2	6.3%	4	4.9%	33	8.0%
	Sunnymeadows	2	6.1%	2	6.3%	7	8.5%	37	9.0%
	Butterfield	2	6.1%	2	6.3%	7	8.5%	30	7.3%
	Hendrick Ranch	1	3.0%	3	9.4%	5	6.1%	26	6.3%
	Serrano	3	9.1%	2	6.3%	8	9.8%	31	7.5%
	Sugar Hill	4	12.1%	3	9.4%	5	6.1%	25	6.1%
	Seneca							4	1.0%
	Creekside	1	3.0%	2	6.3%	1	1.2%	20	4.9%
	Hidden Springs	1	3.0%	1	3.1%	1	1.2%	19	4.6%
	Box Springs	2	6.1%	3	9.4%			25	6.1%
	Ridge Crest	1	3.0%	3	9.4%	3	3.7%	17	4.1%
Total		33	100.0%	32	100.0%	82	100.0%	411	100.0%

N = 411

Correlations

Table 2: Program Implementation

Correlations

		Time Planning Lessons Each Week	Time Teaching Lessons Each Week	Time Assessing Students Each Month	Percent of Language Arts Time Program Was Used	Program Effectiveness Rating	Unsatisfactory Program Components
Time Planning Lessons Each Week	Pearson Correlation	1.000	.544**	.374**	.386**	.098	-.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000	.000	.000	.054	.511
	N	407	403	400	403	390	99
Time Teaching Lessons Each Week	Pearson Correlation	.544**	1.000	.410**	.512**	.173**	.008
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.	.000	.000	.001	.938
	N	403	405	400	403	389	98
Time Assessing Students Each Month	Pearson Correlation	.374**	.410**	1.000	.367**	.152**	.022
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.	.000	.003	.828
	N	400	400	402	399	386	97
Percent of Language Arts Time Program Was Used	Pearson Correlation	.386**	.512**	.367**	1.000	.251**	.004
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.	.000	.967
	N	403	403	399	405	389	99
Program Effectiveness Rating	Pearson Correlation	.098	.173**	.152**	.251**	1.000	.097
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.054	.001	.003	.000	.	.352
	N	390	389	386	389	392	95
Unsatisfactory Program Components	Pearson Correlation	-.067	.008	.022	.004	.097	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.511	.938	.828	.967	.352	.
	N	99	98	97	99	95	99

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

APPENDIX C

Table 3: **Time Spent Each Week/Month Implementing the Invitations to Literacy Program by Grade Level**

		Grade Taught							
		Kindergarten		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade	
		Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %
Month Program Instruction Began	January	1	.2%			1	.2%		
	February			1	.2%				
	March			1	.2%				
	July	16	3.9%	19	4.7%	13	3.2%	19	4.7%
	August	8	2.0%	16	3.9%	17	4.2%	20	4.9%
	September	32	7.9%	20	4.9%	29	7.1%	29	7.1%
	October	2	.5%	7	1.7%	2	.5%	7	1.7%
	November	2	.5%						
	December								
Time Planning Lessons Each Week	Less than 30 minutes	1	.2%	1	.2%	1	.2%	2	.5%
	30 min. - 1 hr.	22	5.4%	3	.7%	4	1.0%	5	1.2%
	2-3 hrs.	21	5.2%	22	5.4%	30	7.4%	37	9.1%
	4-5 hrs.	6	1.5%	22	5.4%	16	3.9%	20	4.9%
	6-7 hrs.	4	1.0%	5	1.2%	3	.7%	8	2.0%
	8+ hrs.	7	1.7%	10	2.5%	8	2.0%	4	1.0%
Time Teaching Lessons Each Week	2 hours or less	15	3.7%	3	.7%	5	1.2%	4	1.0%
	3-4 hrs.	13	3.2%	9	2.2%	7	1.7%	7	1.7%
	5-6 hrs.	13	3.2%	11	2.7%	5	1.2%	22	5.4%
	7-8 hrs.	5	1.2%	9	2.2%	11	2.7%	21	5.2%
	9-10 hrs.	10	2.5%	12	3.0%	9	2.2%	8	2.0%
	10+ hrs.	4	1.0%	21	5.2%	25	6.2%	14	3.5%
Time Assessing Students Each Month	Do not assess monthly	14	3.5%	6	1.5%	8	2.0%	4	1.0%
	1 hour or less	9	2.2%	3	.7%	5	1.2%	2	.5%
	2-3 hrs.	14	3.5%	10	2.5%	15	3.7%	23	5.7%
	4-5 hrs.	12	3.0%	16	4.0%	14	3.5%	12	3.0%
	6 hrs.	5	1.2%	12	3.0%	7	1.7%	9	2.2%
	7 hrs	3	.7%	6	1.5%	2	.5%	4	1.0%
	8+ hrs.	2	.5%	11	2.7%	11	2.7%	21	5.2%
Percent of Language Arts Time Program Was Used	0-25%	7	1.7%	1	.2%	1	.2%	1	.2%
	25-50%	22	5.4%	8	2.0%	13	3.2%	10	2.5%
	50-75%	13	3.2%	21	5.2%	7	1.7%	20	4.9%
	75-90%	16	4.0%	24	5.9%	17	4.2%	29	7.2%
	90-100%	2	.5%	11	2.7%	23	5.7%	15	3.7%

N = 411

Table 3 Cont.

Time Spent Each Week/Month Implementing the Invitations to Literacy Program by Grade Level

		Grade Taught						Total	
		Fourth Grade		Fifth Grade		Grade Not Identified			
		Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %
Month Program Instruction Began	January					1	.2%	3	.7%
	February							1	.2%
	March					1	.2%	2	.5%
	July	8	2.0%	6	1.5%	19	4.7%	100	24.6%
	August	6	1.5%	9	2.2%	12	3.0%	88	21.7%
	September	15	3.7%	14	3.4%	35	8.6%	174	42.9%
	October	1	.2%	3	.7%	5	1.2%	27	6.7%
	November	3	.7%			2	.5%	7	1.7%
	December					4	1.0%	4	1.0%
Time Planning Lessons Each Week	Less than 30 minutes	2	.5%			2	.5%	9	2.2%
	30 min. - 1 hr.	2	.5%	6	1.5%	14	3.4%	56	13.8%
	2-3 hrs.	14	3.4%	12	2.9%	36	8.8%	172	42.3%
	4-5 hrs.	8	2.0%	5	1.2%	16	3.9%	93	22.9%
	6-7 hrs.	4	1.0%	8	2.0%	4	1.0%	36	8.8%
	8+ hrs.	3	.7%	1	.2%	8	2.0%	41	10.1%
Time Teaching Lessons Each Week	2 hours or less	2	.5%			8	2.0%	37	9.1%
	3-4 hrs.	4	1.0%	5	1.2%	21	5.2%	66	16.3%
	5-6 hrs.	14	3.5%	10	2.5%	16	4.0%	91	22.5%
	7-8 hrs.	3	.7%	11	2.7%	9	2.2%	69	17.0%
	9-10 hrs.	7	1.7%	2	.5%	11	2.7%	59	14.6%
	10+ hrs.	3	.7%	4	1.0%	12	3.0%	83	20.5%
Time Assessing Students Each Month	Do not assess monthly	6	1.5%	1	.2%	20	5.0%	59	14.7%
	1 hour or less	3	.7%			9	2.2%	31	7.7%
	2-3 hrs.	5	1.2%	9	2.2%	17	4.2%	93	23.1%
	4-5 hrs.	6	1.5%	10	2.5%	14	3.5%	84	20.9%
	6 hrs.	5	1.2%	5	1.2%	4	1.0%	47	11.7%
	7 hrs.	1	.2%	1	.2%	2	.5%	19	4.7%
	8+ hrs.	6	1.5%	6	1.5%	12	3.0%	69	17.2%
Percent of Language Arts Time Program Was Used	0-25%	1	.2%			4	1.0%	15	3.7%
	25-50%	7	1.7%	6	1.5%	29	7.2%	95	23.5%
	50-75%	8	2.0%	12	3.0%	23	5.7%	104	25.7%
	75-90%	10	2.5%	11	2.7%	13	3.2%	120	29.6%
	90-100%	7	1.7%	3	.7%	10	2.5%	71	17.5%

N = 411

APPENDIX E

Table 4: **Kindergarten Program Implementation Choices**

		Grade Taught	
		Kindergarten	
		Count	Table %
Theme 1	Taught This Theme	39	100.0%
Theme 2	Taught This Theme	36	100.0%
Theme 3	Taught This Theme	37	100.0%
Theme 4	Taught This Theme	37	100.0%
Theme 5	Taught This Theme	44	100.0%
Theme 6	Taught This Theme	40	100.0%
Theme 7	Taught This Theme	32	100.0%
Theme 8	Taught This Theme	31	100.0%
Theme 9	Taught This Theme	26	100.0%
Theme 10	Taught This Theme	17	100.0%
Theme 11	Taught This Theme	8	100.0%
Theme 12	Taught This Theme	7	100.0%
K Preparing to Listen and Read Lessons	Not At All	2	3.3%
	Sometimes	45	73.8%
	Almost Always	14	23.0%
K Reading Strategies Lessons	Not At All	1	1.6%
	Sometimes	25	41.0%
	Almost Always	35	57.4%
K Mini Lessons	Not At All	8	13.6%
	Sometimes	33	55.9%
	Almost Always	18	30.5%
K Reading and Listening Center Lessons	Not At All	1	1.7%
	Sometimes	20	33.3%
	Almost Always	39	65.0%
K Language and Writing Center Lessons	Not At All	3	5.0%
	Sometimes	38	63.3%
	Almost Always	19	31.7%
K Cross Curricular Lessons	Not At All	9	15.0%
	Sometimes	46	76.7%
	Almost Always	5	8.3%
K Watch Me Read Lessons	Not At All	1	1.7%
	Sometimes	10	16.7%
	Almost Always	49	81.7%
Emergent Literacy Survey	Not At All	18	31.6%
	Sometimes	34	59.6%
	Almost Always	5	8.8%
Literacy Activity Book Lessons	Not At All	15	26.3%
	Sometimes	25	43.9%
	Almost Always	17	29.8%
Students Acquring English Progam	Not At All	27	48.2%
	Sometimes	27	48.2%
	Almost Always	2	3.6%
Early Success Program	Not At All	31	67.4%
	Sometimes	14	30.4%
	Almost Always	1	2.2%
Little Book Program	Not at All	9	18.0%
	Sometimes	15	30.0%
	Almost Always	26	52.0%

Total Number ofKindergarten Teachers Responding to Survey = 61

Table 5: **First Through Fifth Grade Program Implementation Choices**

		N=65		N=62		N=76		N=33	
		Grade Taught							
		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade		Fourth Grade	
		Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %
Theme 1	Taught This Theme	29	15.3%	32	16.8%	52	27.4%	14	7.4%
Theme 2	Taught This Theme	29	16.0%	31	17.1%	47	26.0%	16	8.8%
Theme 3	Taught This Theme	28	13.9%	38	18.9%	54	26.9%	20	10.0%
Theme 4	Taught This Theme	33	16.6%	34	17.1%	49	24.6%	23	11.6%
Theme 5	Taught This Theme	31	23.8%	24	18.5%	23	17.7%	9	6.9%
Theme 6	Taught This Theme	27	33.8%	9	11.3%	9	11.3%	6	7.5%
Theme 7	Taught This Theme	24	54.5%			1	2.3%	1	2.3%
Theme 8	Taught This Theme	11	39.3%	2	7.1%	1	3.6%	1	3.6%
Theme 9	Taught This Theme	3	25.0%					1	8.3%
Theme 10	Taught This Theme	3	33.3%			1	11.1%		
Elementary Watch Me Read Lessons	Not At All	2	.6%	2	.6%	38	11.8%	13	4.0%
	Sometimes	8	2.5%	22	6.8%	27	8.4%	13	4.0%
	Almost Always	54	16.7%	38	11.8%	6	1.9%	3	.9%
Preparing to Read and Write Lessons	Not At All	3	.9%	2	.6%	6	1.9%	3	.9%
	Sometimes	38	11.7%	29	9.0%	38	11.7%	18	5.6%
	Almost Always	21	6.5%	30	9.3%	28	8.6%	9	2.8%
High Frequency and Key Word Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%			2	.6%	1	.3%
	Sometimes	3	.9%	10	3.0%	18	5.5%	15	4.5%
	Almost Always	60	18.2%	52	15.8%	54	16.4%	15	4.5%
Elementary Reading Strategies Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	1	.3%	4	1.2%		
	Sometimes	19	5.8%	19	5.8%	32	9.7%	15	4.5%
	Almost Always	44	13.3%	42	12.7%	38	11.5%	16	4.8%
Elementary Mini Lessons	Not At All	2	.6%	2	.6%	4	1.2%	2	.6%
	Sometimes	40	12.1%	26	7.9%	44	13.3%	21	6.4%
	Almost Always	22	6.7%	34	10.3%	26	7.9%	7	2.1%
Reading Comprehension Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%			1	.3%		
	Sometimes	13	4.0%	10	3.0%	11	3.3%	7	2.1%
	Almost Always	50	15.2%	50	15.2%	63	19.1%	24	7.3%
Phonics and Word Skill Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%			1	.3%	1	.3%
	Sometimes	12	3.6%	9	2.7%	19	5.7%	11	3.3%
	Almost Always	51	15.4%	53	16.0%	55	16.6%	19	5.7%
Vocabulary Lessons	Not At All	2	.6%			1	.3%		
	Sometimes	14	4.2%	12	3.6%	4	1.2%	4	1.2%
	Almost Always	48	14.5%	49	14.8%	70	21.2%	27	8.2%
Language and Writing Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%			1	.3%		
	Sometimes	38	11.6%	25	7.6%	20	6.1%	13	4.0%
	Almost Always	25	7.6%	36	10.9%	53	16.1%	17	5.2%

Number of first through fifth grade teachers responding to the survey = 350

Table 5 Cont. **First Through Fifth Grade Program Implementation Choices**

		N=61		N=65 Grade Taught		N=62		N=33	
		First Grade		Second Grade		Third Grade		Fourth Grade	
		Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %
Spelling Lessons	Not At All	7	2.1%	4	1.2%	2	.6%	1	.3%
	Sometimes	13	3.9%	12	3.6%	11	3.3%	6	1.8%
	Almost Always	44	13.3%	46	13.9%	62	18.7%	24	7.2%
Grammar Lessons	Not At All	3	.9%			1	.3%		
	Sometimes	26	7.8%	15	4.5%	7	2.1%	9	2.7%
	Almost Always	35	10.5%	46	13.9%	67	20.2%	23	6.9%
Communication Lessons	Not At All	10	3.1%	12	3.7%	10	3.1%	4	1.2%
	Sometimes	39	12.0%	40	12.3%	47	14.5%	19	5.9%
	Almost Always	13	4.0%	9	2.8%	16	4.9%	8	2.5%
Guided Reading and Writing Lessons	Not At All	3	.9%	2	.6%	4	1.2%	4	1.2%
	Sometimes	29	8.8%	31	9.4%	33	10.0%	10	3.0%
	Almost Always	31	9.4%	29	8.8%	37	11.2%	17	5.2%
Elementary Cross Curricular Lessons	Not At All	8	2.4%	7	2.1%	15	4.5%	7	2.1%
	Sometimes	43	13.0%	47	14.2%	42	12.7%	15	4.5%
	Almost Always	13	3.9%	8	2.4%	18	5.4%	9	2.7%
Emergent Literacy Survey	Not At All	20	6.2%	19	5.9%	49	15.2%	21	6.5%
	Sometimes	21	6.5%	25	7.8%	15	4.7%	8	2.5%
	Almost Always	19	5.9%	15	4.7%	5	1.6%	2	.6%
Literacy Activity Book Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	2	.6%	1	.3%		
	Sometimes	18	5.3%	11	3.2%	7	2.1%	7	2.1%
	Almost Always	44	12.9%	49	14.4%	66	19.4%	25	7.4%
Students Acquring English Progam	Not At All	21	6.4%	20	6.1%	39	11.9%	19	5.8%
	Sometimes	33	10.0%	34	10.3%	25	7.6%	11	3.3%
	Almost Always	7	2.1%	6	1.8%	8	2.4%	1	.3%
Spelling Book Program	Not At All	10	3.0%	9	2.7%	14	4.2%	6	1.8%
	Sometimes	21	6.3%	17	5.1%	12	3.6%	9	2.7%
	Almost Always	31	9.3%	34	10.2%	47	14.2%	16	4.8%
Early Success Program	Not At All	22	6.9%	21	6.6%	48	15.0%	17	5.3%
	Sometimes	24	7.5%	29	9.1%	17	5.3%	9	2.8%
	Almost Always	14	4.4%	12	3.8%	4	1.3%	1	.3%
Little Book Program	Not at All	9	2.7%	8	2.4%	43	13.0%	18	5.5%
	Sometimes	6	1.8%	23	7.0%	22	6.7%	10	3.0%
	Almost Always	48	14.5%	31	9.4%	7	2.1%	1	.3%

Number of first through fifth grade teachers responding to the survey = 350

Table 5 Cont. **First Through Fifth Grade Program Implementation Choices**

		Grade Taught N = 32		N = 82		Total	
		Fifth Grade		Grade Not Identified			
		Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %
Theme 1	Taught This Theme	22	11.6%	41	21.6%	190	100.0%
Theme 2	Taught This Theme	20	11.0%	38	21.0%	181	100.0%
Theme 3	Taught This Theme	23	11.4%	38	18.9%	201	100.0%
Theme 4	Taught This Theme	21	10.6%	39	19.6%	199	100.0%
Theme 5	Taught This Theme	12	9.2%	31	23.8%	130	100.0%
Theme 6	Taught This Theme	7	8.8%	22	27.5%	80	100.0%
Theme 7	Taught This Theme	3	6.8%	15	34.1%	44	100.0%
Theme 8	Taught This Theme	1	3.6%	12	42.9%	28	100.0%
Theme 9	Taught This Theme			8	66.7%	12	100.0%
Theme 10	Taught This Theme			5	55.6%	9	100.0%
Elementary Watch Me Read Lessons	Not At All	14	4.3%	13	4.0%	82	25.4%
	Sometimes	14	4.3%	28	8.7%	112	34.7%
	Almost Always	2	.6%	26	8.0%	129	39.9%
Preparing to Read and Write Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	9	2.8%	24	7.4%
	Sometimes	19	5.9%	31	9.6%	173	53.4%
	Almost Always	10	3.1%	29	9.0%	127	39.2%
High Frequency and Key Word Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	6	1.8%	11	3.3%
	Sometimes	13	3.9%	17	5.2%	76	23.0%
	Almost Always	17	5.2%	45	13.6%	243	73.6%
Elementary Reading Strategies Lessons	Not At All			5	1.5%	11	3.3%
	Sometimes	19	5.8%	20	6.1%	124	37.6%
	Almost Always	12	3.6%	43	13.0%	195	59.1%
Elementary Mini Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	11	3.3%	22	6.7%
	Sometimes	18	5.5%	32	9.7%	181	54.8%
	Almost Always	13	3.9%	25	7.6%	127	38.5%
Reading Comprehension Lessons	Not At All			5	1.5%	7	2.1%
	Sometimes	7	2.1%	18	5.5%	66	20.1%
	Almost Always	25	7.6%	44	13.4%	256	77.8%
Phonics and Word Skill Lessons	Not At All			6	1.8%	9	2.7%
	Sometimes	14	4.2%	22	6.6%	87	26.2%
	Almost Always	18	5.4%	40	12.0%	236	71.1%
Vocabulary Lessons	Not At All			4	1.2%	7	2.1%
	Sometimes	2	.6%	13	3.9%	49	14.8%
	Almost Always	29	8.8%	51	15.5%	274	83.0%
Language and Writing Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	4	1.2%	7	2.1%
	Sometimes	10	3.0%	24	7.3%	130	39.5%
	Almost Always	21	6.4%	40	12.2%	192	58.4%

Number of first through fifth grade teachers responding to the survey = 350

Table 5 Cont. **First Through Fifth Grade Program Implementation Choices**

		N: 3rd Grade Taught		N: 5th		Total	
		Fifth Grade		Grade Not Identified			
		Count	Table %	Count	Table %	Count	Table %
Spelling Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	9	2.7%	24	7.2%
	Sometimes	5	1.5%	15	4.5%	62	18.7%
	Almost Always	26	7.8%	44	13.3%	246	74.1%
Grammar Lessons	Not At All			3	.9%	7	2.1%
	Sometimes	5	1.5%	21	6.3%	83	25.0%
	Almost Always	27	8.1%	44	13.3%	242	72.9%
Communication Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	11	3.4%	48	14.8%
	Sometimes	20	6.2%	31	9.6%	196	60.5%
	Almost Always	11	3.4%	23	7.1%	80	24.7%
Guided Reading and Writing Lessons	Not At All	1	.3%	6	1.8%	20	6.1%
	Sometimes	15	4.5%	29	8.8%	147	44.5%
	Almost Always	16	4.8%	33	10.0%	163	49.4%
Elementary Cross Curricular Lessons	Not At All	5	1.5%	11	3.3%	53	16.0%
	Sometimes	20	6.0%	43	13.0%	210	63.3%
	Almost Always	7	2.1%	14	4.2%	69	20.8%
Emergent Literacy Survey	Not At All	20	6.2%	32	9.9%	161	50.0%
	Sometimes	9	2.8%	28	8.7%	106	32.9%
	Almost Always	2	.6%	12	3.7%	55	17.1%
Literacy Activity Book Lessons	Not At All			8	2.4%	12	3.5%
	Sometimes	7	2.1%	20	5.9%	70	20.6%
	Almost Always	25	7.4%	49	14.4%	258	75.9%
Students Acquring English Progam	Not At All	15	4.6%	43	13.1%	157	47.7%
	Sometimes	14	4.3%	27	8.2%	144	43.8%
	Almost Always	2	.6%	4	1.2%	28	8.5%
Spelling Book Program	Not At All	5	1.5%	28	8.4%	72	21.7%
	Sometimes	4	1.2%	12	3.6%	75	22.6%
	Almost Always	23	6.9%	34	10.2%	185	55.7%
Early Success Program	Not At All	21	6.6%	39	12.2%	168	52.7%
	Sometimes	6	1.9%	24	7.5%	109	34.2%
	Almost Always	3	.9%	8	2.5%	42	13.2%
Little Book Program	Not at All	20	6.1%	17	5.2%	115	34.8%
	Sometimes	6	1.8%	26	7.9%	93	28.2%
	Almost Always	3	.9%	32	9.7%	122	37.0%

Number of first through fifth grade teachers responding to the survey = 350

APPENDIX E

Table 6: **Program Effectiveness Ratings by School**

		Program Effectiveness Rating								Total	
		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor			
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
School Name	School Not Identified	1	3.4%	5	17.2%	22	75.9%	1	3.4%	29	100.0%
	Edgemont	5	17.9%	7	25.0%	13	46.4%	3	10.7%	28	100.0%
	Midland			15	51.7%	11	37.9%	3	10.3%	29	100.0%
	Moreno	2	8.3%	4	16.7%	17	70.8%	1	4.2%	24	100.0%
	Armada	3	10.3%	6	20.7%	16	55.2%	4	13.8%	29	100.0%
	Bear Valley	3	10.0%	9	30.0%	16	53.3%	2	6.7%	30	100.0%
	Sunnymeadows	1	2.9%	7	20.6%	20	58.8%	6	17.6%	34	100.0%
	Butterfield	3	10.3%	6	20.7%	19	65.5%	1	3.4%	29	100.0%
	Hendrick Ranch	2	7.7%	7	26.9%	17	65.4%			26	100.0%
	Serrano	6	20.0%	11	36.7%	13	43.3%			30	100.0%
	Sugar Hill	1	4.2%	9	37.5%	14	58.3%			24	100.0%
	Seneca					4	100.0%			4	100.0%
	Creekside	1	5.9%	4	23.5%	10	58.8%	2	11.8%	17	100.0%
	Hidden Springs			5	27.8%	9	50.0%	4	22.2%	18	100.0%
	Box Springs			14	58.3%	9	37.5%	1	4.2%	24	100.0%
	Ridge Crest			6	35.3%	11	64.7%			17	100.0%
Total		28	7.1%	115	29.3%	221	56.4%	28	7.1%	392	100.0%

Table 7: **Program Effectiveness Ratings by Grade Level**

		Program Effectiveness Rating								Total	
		Excellent		Good		Fair		Poor			
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
Grade Taught	Kindergarten	9	15.3%	32	54.2%	18	30.5%			59	100.0%
	First Grade	3	4.8%	17	27.0%	39	61.9%	4	6.3%	63	100.0%
	Second Grade	3	5.2%	4	6.9%	41	70.7%	10	17.2%	58	100.0%
	Third Grade	2	2.7%	19	26.0%	44	60.3%	8	11.0%	73	100.0%
	Fourth Grade	3	9.4%	10	31.3%	19	59.4%			32	100.0%
	Fifth Grade	1	3.1%	13	40.6%	18	56.3%			32	100.0%
	Grade Not Identified	7	9.3%	20	26.7%	42	56.0%	6	8.0%	75	100.0%
Total		28	7.1%	115	29.3%	221	56.4%	28	7.1%	392	100.0%

APPENDIX F

Tables

Table 8: **Unsatisfactory Program Components by School**

		Unsatisfactory Program Components								Unsatisfactory Program		Total	
		Teacher Support Materials		Instructional Materials		Assessment Materials		Other		Does Not Apply			
		Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %	Count	Row %
School Name	School Not Identified			2	28.6%	1	14.3%	1	14.3%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
	Edgemont			1	12.5%	2	25.0%	2	25.0%	3	37.5%	8	100.0%
	Midland	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	2	40.0%	1	20.0%			5	100.0%
	Moreno							4	57.1%	3	42.9%	7	100.0%
	Armada			1	10.0%	5	50.0%	1	10.0%	3	30.0%	10	100.0%
	Bear Valley	1	20.0%			2	40.0%	1	20.0%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%
	Sunnymeadows			2	15.4%	7	53.8%	2	15.4%	2	15.4%	13	100.0%
	Butterfield	1	20.0%			4	80.0%					5	100.0%
	Hendrick Ranch			2	28.6%	4	57.1%			1	14.3%	7	100.0%
	Serrano					6	100.0%					6	100.0%
	Sugar Hill					3	60.0%	2	40.0%			5	100.0%
	Creekside					2	40.0%	2	40.0%	1	20.0%	5	100.0%
	Hidden Springs			1	16.7%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	2	33.3%	6	100.0%
	Box Springs			1	16.7%	1	16.7%			4	66.7%	6	100.0%
	Ridge Crest	1	25.0%			2	50.0%	1	25.0%			4	100.0%
Total		4	4.0%	11	11.1%	42	42.4%	19	19.2%	23	23.2%	99	100.0%

APPENDIX G